

Appl. No. 09/885,984

Att'y Dkt. No. 113378-039

Response to Office Action mailed November 15, 2004

REMARKS

The final Office Action was issued on claims 6, 7, 11, 12 and 14-27 which are pending and under consideration. Claims 6, 7, 11, 12 and 14-27 stand rejected. In this Response, claims 6, 11 and 20 have been amended, claim 7 has been cancelled without prejudice and no claims have been added. Thus, claims 6, 11, 12 and 14-27 are pending and under consideration in the application. Claims 1-5 and 8-10 stand withdrawn and claim 7 and 13 stand cancelled.

Applicants invite the Examiner to call Applicants' Representative to discuss any issues with this application.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103(a)

At page 2 of the Office Action, claims 6, 7, 11, 12, 14-17, 19, 21-24 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,884,604 to Rice et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,452,751 to Engler, III, et al. Claims 18 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rice et al. in view of Engler, III, et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,367,933 to Jaksha. Claims 20 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rice et al. in view of Engler, III, et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,868,188 to Fukuda. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claims 6 and 11 have been amended to clarify the claims. Amended claim 6 clarifies that the at least three groups of hole patterns are "router mounting hole patterns centered around a common router bit hole through the table top." Further, claim 6 has been clarified to recite "each group having a unique combination of radial distances from a center of the router bit hole and angular positions around the router bit hole, wherein the at least three groups are capable of mounting routers having different mounting hole arrangements." Claim 11 has been similarly amended. Applicants submit that the amendments clarify the text of the claims rather than adding further limitations. Accordingly, this Response does not raise new issues and should be considered.

Rice et al. shows and describes a router 30 mounted to a router mounting plate 24. Several elongated slots are shown in Figs. 1 and 3 around an opening for a router bit 32. Apparently, the Office Action asserts that the elongated slots are holes for mounting the router

Appl. No. 09/885,984

Atty Dkt. No. 113378-039

Response to Office Action mailed November 15, 2004

30 to the plate 24. However, the Rice et al. elongated slots do not represent at least three groups of router mounting hole patterns in which each group has a unique combination of radial distances from the router bit opening and angular positions around the router bit opening. Indeed, the previous Office Action dated May 28, 2004 acknowledges that Rice et al. does not disclose each group having different hole center distance and at least two groups having different radial hole center distances.

As to Engler, III, et al., Engler, III, et al. shows and describes a plate 10 having a large hole 20 and a smaller hole 22 for a router bit. A router 18 can be mounted to the plate 10 at two different positions. One mounting position of the router 18 has the router bit in the large hole 20, and the other mounting position of the router 18 has the router bit in the smaller hole 22. See column 2, lines 23-36. The Engler, III, et al. plate 10 does not have any router mounting holes; rather the mounting holes for the router 18 must be manually drilled by the user. See column 2, lines 36-45. Engler, III, et al. shows two rows of small holes 25A, 25B in the plate 10. However, the two rows of small holes 25A, 25B are pivot holes 28A, 28B which provide pivot locations for pivoting or rotating motion of the plate 10 about a chosen pivot point. See column 2, lines 45-60. The pivot holes are simply not router mounting holes. Accordingly, Engler, III, et al. does not show or describe at least three groups of router mounting hole patterns centered around a common router bit hole. Furthermore, Engler, III, et al. does not show or describe each group of router mounting holes having a unique combination of radial distances from the router bit opening and angular positions around the router bit opening.

Applicants' claimed invention provides advantages. For example, Applicants' router table can be easily used with various different routers. Special mounting adapters may not be required to mount the different routers. Further, problems and difficulties with users drilling mounting holes can be avoided.

The dependent claims have been amended to be consistent with the independent claims.

The dependent claims are allowable at least for the same reasons that their respective independent claims are allowable.

Thus, Applicants submit that the §103 rejections should be withdrawn.

* Appl. No. 09/885,984

Atty Dkt. No. 113378-039

Response to Office Action mailed November 15, 2004

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the patent application is in condition for allowance and request a Notice of Allowance be issued.

Respectfully submitted,

EVEREST INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP

Date: March 15, 2005

BY 

Michael S. Leonard, Reg. No. 37,557

P.O. Box 708

Northbrook, IL 60065

Phone: (847) 272-3400